1 2 3	AARON J. MOHAMED (SBN 245915) BRERETON LAW OFFICE, APC 1362 Pacific Ave., Suite 221 Santa Cruz, CA 95060 ajm@brereton.law	,
4	Attorneys for Plaintiffs / Creditors  MARK ELWARD and MICHAEL ELWARD	)
5	UNITED STATE	ES BANKRUPTCY COURT
6	NORTHERN D	ISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	SAN FR	ANCISCO DIVISION
8		
9	In Re:	Case No.
10	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, PG&E Corporation,	ADVERSARY COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
11	Debtors	RE: PUNITIVE DAMAGES, ATTORNEY FEES, NONDISCHARGEABILITY, PROPER IDENTITY
12 13	(U.S. Bankruptcy Proceedings 19-	OF DEBTOR, OBJECTION TO DISCHARGE
13	30088, and 19-30098)	FEDERAL RULE OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE § 7001 ET SEQ.
15		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
16		
17		
18	Mark Elward, an individual, and Mike Elward, an individual	
19	Creditors / Plaintiffs	•
20	vs.	
21	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a	
22	California Corporation and Public Utility, and PG&E Corporation, a California	
23	Corporation and Public Utility,	•
24	Debtors / Defendants.	•
25	111	
26	111	
27	111	
28	111	1
,	Case: 19-30088	I. SARY COMPUNITO 6/14/19 15:29:41 Page 1 of
		22

#### I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

1. California Public Utilities Code section 2106 states:

"Any public utility which does, causes to be done, or permits any act, matter, or thing prohibited or declared unlawful, or which omits to do any act, matter, or thing required to be done, either by the Constitution, any law of this State, or any order or decision of the commission, shall be liable to the persons or corporations affected thereby for all loss, damages, or injury caused thereby or resulting therefrom. If the court finds that the act or omission was willful, it may, in addition to the actual damages, award exemplary damages."

2. California Public Utilities Code section 2106 also states:

"An action to recover for such loss, damage, or injury may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction by any corporation or person."

- 3. Plaintiffs filed the underlying State Court action on December 14, 2018, Santa Cruz Superior Court Case number 18CV03627 (the "State Court Action"). The State Court Action concerns Plaintiffs' development of an apartment complex at the property known as 153 E. Riverside Dr., Watsonville, CA 95076 (referred to herein as either the "Property" / the "Riverside Drive Property" / the "Riverside Drive Development" or the "Development"). Plaintiffs engaged with Defendant Pacific Gas and Electric Company in order to secure utility connections for the Riverside Drive Development. As set forth more fully herein and as to be proven at trial, Defendant committed a series of negligent, willfully negligent, malicious, fraudulent, and deceitful actions which proximately caused substantial damage to Plaintiffs. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's actions caused substantial delay in the completion of the Development and caused Plaintiffs to be financially damaged and to incur additional cost and expense as set forth more fully herein and in amounts to be proven at trial.
- 4. In the State Court Action, Plaintiffs named Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a California Corporation and Public Utility; and Does 1-99 as party Defendants, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
- 5. On January 29, 2019, Debtor Pacific Gas and Electric Company filed Chapter 11

Bankruptcy proceeding number 19-30089. Also on January 29, 2019, Debtor PG&E Corporation filed Chapter 11 Bankruptcy proceeding number 19-30088.

- 6. On March 29, 2019 Plaintiffs filed Proof of Claim #34 against Debtor PG&E Corporation. On June 14, 2019 Plaintiffs filed Proof of Claim #54 against Debtor Pacific Gas and Electric Company. (Exhibits A and B hereto supporting documentation omitted).
- 7. By this adversary proceeding, under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7001 et seq., Plaintiffs seek injunctive and declaratory relief in determining that Defendants, and each of them, acted intentionally, willfully, maliciously, and / or grossly negligent, such that punitive damages are and shall be rightly and properly imposed under applicable California State Law, including but not limited to California Code of Civil Procedure section 3294. Upon such a finding, Plaintiffs would amend their Proofs of Claim on file to reflect such an award of punitive damages.
- 8. Further by this adversary proceeding, Plaintiffs hereby object to any discharge contemplated by the Chapter Eleven Bankruptcy Proceedings referenced above (cases 19-30088 and 19-30089), under all applicable law including but not limited to 11 USC section 727 et seq.
- 9. Further by this adversary proceeding, Plaintiffs seek a determination that the debts owed to Plaintiffs as set forth in their proofs of claim (Claims #34 in Case 19-30088 and #54 in case 19-30089) are nondischargeable, pursuant to all applicable law including but not limited to 11 USC section 523 et seq.
- 10. Further by this adversary proceeding, Plaintiffs seek a court declarative order, determining which entity subject to the instant Bankruptcies are the true Debtor to Claimants debt for the wrongful acts alleged herein, and in the underlying State Court Action

#### II. JURISDICTION, VENUE, and CONSENT TO FINAL ORDERS

1. Pursuant to 28 USC section 157, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court has jurisdiction to hear and determine adversary proceedings brought pursuant to the portions of the Federal Rules and United States Code relevant herein, including FRBP 7001, 11 USC section 523 and 11 USC section 727.

- 2. Venue in this Court is proper because this is the Court where the instant Bankruptcy Petitions (19-30088, 19-30089) are pending (28 USC § 1409(a)).
- 3. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7008(a), Plaintiffs consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the bankruptcy court only as to those matters determined to be core-bankruptcy matters under applicable law, including but not limited to 28 USC section 157 et seq.

#### III. IDENTITY AND CAPACITY OF PARTIES

- 1. At all times herein concerned, Plaintiff Mark Elward is and has been an individual residing in the County of Santa Cruz.
- 2. At all times herein concerned, Plaintiff Michael ("Mike") Elward is and has been an individual residing in the County of Santa Cruz. Plaintiffs Mark Elward and Mike Elward are natural brothers.
- 3. Defendant Pacific Gas and Electric Company is a California Corporation doing business in the County of Santa Cruz. Defendant Pacific Gas and Electric Company is a public utility, providing utility services to members of the public.
- 4. At all times herein concerned, Defendant Pacific Gas and Electric Company is and has been bound to the statutes and authorities contained in the California Public Utilities Code and other applicable law.
- 5. It is alleged herein, as set forth above, that Defendant / Debtor PG&E Corporation is a California Corporation doing business in the County of Santa Cruz. Defendant PG& Corporation is a public utility, providing utility services to members of the public.
- 6. At all times herein concerned, Defendant PG&E Corporation is and has been bound to the statutes and authorities contained in the California Public Utilities Code and other applicable law.
- 7. At all times mentioned herein, each defendant, were the agents and/or employees of each of the remaining co-defendants and in doing the things stated herein were acting within the scope of such agency and/or employment.

#### IV. FACTUAL SUMMARY OF STATE COURT CLAIM

- 8. In or around 2015, Plaintiffs commenced efforts to develop the Riverside Drive Property into an apartment complex of fourteen apartments.
- 9. In or around middle year 2015, Plaintiffs contacted Defendant PG&E for the first time related to the Riverside Drive Development. This contact was made via Plaintiffs' architect on the project, Daryl Woods. Mr. Woods spoke with PG&E Representative William Clifton.
- 10. Through their architect Mr. Woods, Plaintiffs communicated their need to apply for a utility connection for the Development that they were planning. Plaintiff expressed to Defendant's representative Mr. Clifton that they were pursuing their application for services even before groundbreaking on the project, in order to ensure that everything went smoothly. PG&E represented that they would act diligently to ensure a smooth application and connection process.
- 11. In October 2015, Plaintiffs filed an application for connection of utilities with Defendant PG&E. Defendant invoiced Plaintiffs for the application fee of \$5,000.00, which Plaintiffs paid.
- 12. On October 20, 2015, Defendant PG&E acknowledged their receipt of Plaintiffs' application for connection of utilities. This acknowledgement was in the form of a letter directed to Plaintiff Mark Elward.
- 13. In or around April 2016, Plaintiffs secured a construction loan for financing of the Development. Plaintiffs secured a construction loan of \$2,500,000.00 from Santa Cruz County Bank. According to the terms of that loan, the loan was due and payable on July 12, 2017.
  - 14. Plaintiffs broke ground on the development in 2016.
- 15. From October 2015 onward, Plaintiffs communicated numerous times with PG&E, mostly through its representative William Clifton. Mr. Clifton represented to Plaintiffs that he was the PG&E representative who was handling their connection application through all of its stages, including acting as the inspector on their final inspections. Mr. Clifton at all times

represented that he was empowered by Defendant to act in such a manner, including as inspector, and that he had the authority to sign off on inspections on behalf of Defendant.

- 16. Throughout the entirety of the construction of the Development, Plaintiffs followed every instruction and mandate given to them by Defendant PG&E.
- 17. In or around October 2016, Mr. Clifton represented to Plaintiffs that their connection had been approved, and that he had a "trench package" in hand for Plaintiffs. Mr. Clifton directed Plaintiffs to meet him at the Property to receive the trench package.
- 18. Plaintiffs met Defendant's representative Mr. Clifton at the Riverside Property in October, 2016. At the October 2016 meeting, Mr. Clifton changed his position and made an excuse for not having the trench package ready. Mr. Clifton informed Plaintiffs that he was unable to approve the requested utility connection.
- 19. In January 2017 Plaintiffs again met Mr. Clifton at the Property. Mr. Clifton provided Plaintiffs with a map, materials information, and directions for installing electrical conduit and gas lines. Plaintiffs followed Mr. Clifton's instructions and ran gas and electrical connections at the Development, per said instructions.
- 20. In March and April, 2017 Mr. Clifton met with Plaintiffs and conducted inspections based on the requirements previously given to Plaintiffs, in order for the Development to be ready for connection to utility service. Mr. Clifton represented that he was the inspector, acting on behalf of Defendant PG&E, and that he had authority to act as inspector.
- 21. In April 2017, PG&E, through their representative Clifton, approved Plaintiffs' development for utility connection and informed Plaintiffs that they would have connection within four weeks.
- 22. In or around April, 2017, Defendant PG&E refunded Plaintiffs' application fee of \$5,000.00. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant PG&E lost or destroyed their application for utility services.
- 23. In or around May, 2017, Defendant representative Christina Reyes contacted Plaintiffs. Ms. Reyes represented to Plaintiffs that the Development could not be connected for service, because they had not received a "trench package," that William Clifton was not an

authorized PG&E inspector, that substantial rains in 2017 had delayed all projects, and other representations.

- 24. Ongoing from May 2017, Defendant PG&E caused more and further delays to utility connections for the development. Despite reasonable and diligent efforts by Plaintiffs to comply with Defendant's demands, Defendant continued to refuse to connect utility service. These delays caused by Defendant include but are not limited to PG&E demanding the following items:
  - a. Plaintiffs were required to move a gas-line which Plaintiffs had installed per prior representations by PG&E.
  - b. Plaintiffs were required to wait months more to be provided with a "trench package" without which, utility connections could not be made.
  - c. Plaintiffs were required to pursue obtaining an easement from the Department of Transportation, to allow service lines to be run across a state highway (this turned out to not be necessary).
- 25. At all times herein concerned, Plaintiffs proceeded in a reasonable manner in the furtherance of the Riverside Drive Development project. Plaintiffs actions are not all recited herein, but include and are not limited to the following:
  - a. Obtaining all necessary State, County, and Local permits and permissions for the project.
  - b. Complying with all demands and requirements asserted by Defendant PG&E in order to be eligible for utilities connection. Plaintiffs also reasonably relied on the various representations made by PG&E, including by its representatives William Clifton, Christina Reyes, and others. This also includes performing acts at the behest and requirement of Defendant, which acts turned out later to be unnecessary.
  - c. Securing apartment tenants at a time when it was reasonable for Plaintiffs to believe that the Development would be completed by the move-in date of said tenants (Plaintiffs had enough applications for apartment rentals to rent the

- entire complex because of Defendant's actions, Plaintiffs were not able to enter into lease agreements with these parties).
- d. Adequately funding, managing, and supervising the Development Project in accordance with State, County, and Local codes and regulations.
- 26. In doing the above acts and other and further acts which continued to cause delay to the completion of the Development, Defendant PG&E acted unreasonably. Further, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant representative William Clifton had previously made similar untrue representations as to his station with PG&E and authority to act as a PG&E inspector. Therefore Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant PG&E acted willfully negligent, or with intentional malice or oppression, or both.
- 27. In July 2017, Plaintiffs contacted Defendant PG&E through their attorney Robert Bosso to request a temporary utility connection while Plaintiffs were clearing further hurdles put into place by PG&E. Defendant PG&E refused this request.
- 28. Defendant PG&E did not end up providing the Development with utility connections until March, 2018.
- 29. All in all Defendant caused a substantial and unreasonable delay in providing utility connections for the Riverside Drive Development, and thereby caused damage and expense to Plaintiffs as set forth herein, and in an amount to be proven at trial. These damages and expenses include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Lost rent for the development, from August 1, 2017 through the opening of the Development on April 1, 2018
  - b. Increased in the costs of a loan that Plaintiffs were required to get from Fremont Bank, to cover expenses incurred due to PG&E's unreasonable delay, and to Plaintiffs' original construction loan coming due.
  - c. Cost to relocate a gas line which Plaintiffs had installed per PG&E specifications, which later had to be moved.
  - d. Fee for renewal of construction loan and increased loan costs.
  - e. Running temporary power to the Development.

- f. Replanting landscaping after relocation of utility lines.
- g. Water costs for replacement of landscaping.
- h. Cost to repave parking lot after moving gas line.
- 30. The State Court Action having been stayed by the filing of the instant Bankruptcy petitions, Plaintiffs bring this adversary proceeding and hereby seek the relief set forth and described herein.

#### V. ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING OBJECTION TO DISCHARGE

- a. Debtors' Underlying Conduct Constitutes Willful and Intentional Misconduct
- 31. At all times herein concerned, Defendant PG&E had a duty to act in such a way as to not cause unreasonable delay in the processing of Plaintiffs' utility connection, nor to mislead Plaintiffs, nor to cause Plaintiffs to reasonably rely on Defendant's misrepresentations, nor to cause damage to Plaintiffs, among other duties, including but not limited to those set forth under California Public Utilities Code section 2106.
- 32. In doing the foregoing acts, Defendant PG&E intentionally breached their duty of care towards Plaintiff.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of PG&E's intentional misconduct, as set forth above and as alleged herein, Plaintiffs suffered damages included but not limited to those items listed above, and other such damages to be proven at trial.
- 34. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that, in doing the wrongful acts as set forth above and to be proven at trial, Defendants acted in doing the aforementioned acts, Defendants and each of them knowingly, intentionally, and willfully engaged in the foregoing conduct which they knew was substantially certain to wrongfully harm Plaintiff, and Defendants knowingly, willfully, and intentionally exposed Plaintiff to unjust hardship through such conduct, all of which amounts to "oppression" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 3294. In engaging in the aforementioned conduct, Defendants consciously

disregarded the rights of Plaintiff, all of which amounts to "malice" within Civil Code Section 3294. All of the aforementioned conduct of Defendants amounts to "despicable conduct" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 3294. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff should be awarded punitive damages against the Defendants and each of them.

#### b. Debtors' Underlying Conduct Constitutes Gross Negligence / Malice

At all times herein concerned, Defendant PG&E had a duty to act in such a way as to not cause unreasonable delay in the processing of Plaintiffs' utility connection, nor to mislead Plaintiffs, nor to cause Plaintiffs to reasonably rely on Defendant's misrepresentations, nor to cause damage to Plaintiffs, among other duties, including but not limited to those set forth under California Public Utilities Code section 2106.

- 35. In doing the foregoing acts, Defendant PG&E willfully and unreasonably breached their duties of care towards Plaintiff.
- 36. As a direct and proximate result of PG&E's willfully negligent misconduct, as set forth above and as shall be proven at trial, Plaintiffs suffered damages included but not limited to those items listed above, and other such damages to be proven at trial.
- 37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that, in doing the wrongful acts as set forth above and to be proven at trial, Defendants acted in doing the aforementioned acts, Defendants and each of them knowingly, intentionally, and willfully engaged in the foregoing conduct which they knew was substantially certain to wrongfully harm Plaintiff, and Defendants knowingly, willfully, and intentionally exposed Plaintiff to unjust hardship through such conduct, all of which amounts to "oppression" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 3294. In engaging in the aforementioned conduct, Defendants consciously disregarded the rights of Plaintiff, all of which amounts to "malice" within Civil Code Section 3294. All of the aforementioned conduct of Defendants amounts to "despicable conduct"

within the meaning of Civil Code Section 3294. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff should be awarded punitive damages against the Defendants and each of them.

#### c. <u>Debtors' Underlying Conduct Constitutes Fraud.</u>

- 38.At all times herein concerned, Defendant PG&E had a duty to act in such a way as to not cause unreasonable delay in the processing of Plaintiffs' utility connection, nor to mislead Plaintiffs, nor to cause Plaintiffs to reasonably rely on Defendant's misrepresentations, nor to cause damage to Plaintiffs, among other duties, including but not limited to those set forth under California Public Utilities Code section 2106.
- 39. During the course of the above actions taken by Defendants, and others such actions as to be proven at trial, Defendant made a series of representations to Plaintiffs regarding the necessary actions that Plaintiffs were required to take in order to obtain utility connections for the Development, and the station and capacity of Defendant's representatives such as William Clifton and Christina Reyes, and other representations.
- 40. At the time that Defendant made such representations to Plaintiffs, as set forth herein and such as to be otherwise proven at trial, Defendant intended that Plaintiffs rely on the truthfulness of said representations.
- 41. At the time that Defendant made such representations to Plaintiff, as set forth herein and such as to be otherwise proven at trial, Defendant knew or should have known that the representations were false or misleading, or both.
- 42. Plaintiffs reasonably relied on the representations made by Defendant as set forth herein and such as to be otherwise proven at trial.
- 43. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs' reasonable reliance on Defendant's representations, as set forth above and such as shall be proven at trial, Plaintiffs

suffered damages included but not limited to those items listed above, and other such damages to be proven at trial.

- 44. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that, in doing the wrongful acts as set forth above and to be proven at trial, Defendants acted in doing the aforementioned acts, Defendants and each of them knowingly, intentionally, and willfully engaged in the foregoing conduct which they knew was substantially certain to wrongfully harm Plaintiff, and Defendants knowingly, willfully, and intentionally exposed Plaintiff to unjust hardship through such conduct, all of which amounts to "oppression" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 3294. In engaging in the aforementioned conduct, Defendants consciously disregarded the rights of Plaintiff, all of which amounts to "malice" within Civil Code Section 3294. All of the aforementioned conduct of Defendants amounts to "despicable conduct" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 3294. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff should be awarded punitive damages against the Defendants and each of them.
- 45. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate and reallege the foregoing allegations contained in this Complaint.
- 46. In doing the foregoing and other acts, and in making the foregoing representations and others such representations as to be proven at trial, Plaintiffs and Defendants entered into one or more legally binding contracts.
- 47. Plaintiffs fully performed the obligations which they were obligated to perform under the terms of the contracts entered into with Defendants as alleged herein and such as to be more fully proven at trial.
  - 48. Defendants breached their obligations under the terms of the contracts entered into

27

28

with Plaintiffs as alleged herein and as shall be more fully proven at trial. Such breaches by Defendants were without reasonable excuse.

49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach of contract(s), Plaintiffs suffered damages included but not limited to those items listed above, and other such damages to be proven at trial. Plaintiffs suffered such damages based on both Defendant's failure to perform its obligations and based on actions taken by Plaintiffs in reasonable reliance on Defendants' representations, as set forth herein.

#### **RELIEF SOUGHT**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs submit their case to this Court to redress the wrongs committed by Defendant, as set forth herein and such as to be proven at trial, and respectfully request the following relief from this Court:

- 1. A Declaratory Order of the Court, providing that Debtors Pacific Gas and Electric Company and PG&E Corporation are both jointly and severally liable for the underlying debt as claimed and set forth in the State Court Action, and as reflected on the Proofs of Claim filed by Plaintiffs herein; and
- An Declaratory Order of the Court, providing that Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages in the underlying State Court Action, and that their Proofs of Claim on file herein shall be modified to reflect the addition of such punitive damages;
- A Declaratory Order of the Court, providing that the claims asserted by Plaintiffs in the underlying State Court Action, and as set forth in their Proofs of Claim on file herein, are nondischargeable; and
- 4. For an Order, denying any discharge of Debtors Pacific Gas and Electric Company and PG&E Corporation debts at issue in the pending Bankruptcy actions; and
- 5. For an Order awarding attorney fees and costs against Defendants / Debtors, and each of them; and,
- 6. For all such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just and proper.

Date: June 14, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

BRÉRETON LAW OFFICE, APC

By: Aaron J. Mohamed, Esq.

Attorney for Plaintiffs / Creditors, Mike Elward

and Mark Elward

## **EXHIBIT A**

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 2548 Filed: 06/14/19 Entered: 06/14/19 15:29:41 Page 15 of 22

Fill in this information to identify the case:						
Debtor 1 PG&E Corporation						
Debtor 2						
(Spouse, if filing)						
United States Bankruptcy Court	Northern District of California					
Case number: 19-30088						

#### **FILED**

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Northern District of California

3/29/2019

Edward J. Emmons, Clerk

## Official Form 410 Proof of Claim

04/16

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies of any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. Do not send original documents; they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Clair	n 							
1. Who is the current creditor?	Mark Elward							
	Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)							
	Other names the creditor used with the debtor							
2.Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	✓ No ☐ Yes. From whom?							
3.Where should notices	Where should notices to the creditor be sent?	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different)						
and payments to the creditor be sent?	Mark Elward	uncion						
Federal Rule of	Name	Name						
Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g)	Aaron J. Mohamed, Esq. Brereton Law Office, APC 1362 Pacific Ave., Suite 221 Santa Cruz, CA 95060							
	Contact phone(831) 429–6391	Contact phone						
	Contact email <u>ajm@brereton.law</u>	Contact email						
	Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapte	er 13 (if you use one):						
4.Does this claim amend one already filed?	<ul> <li>✓ No</li> <li>✓ Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known</li> </ul>	wn) Filed on						
		MM / DD / YYYY						
5.Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	Yes. Who made the earlier filing?							

Official Form 410

Proof of Claim

page 1

6.Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?		No Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's accoun	nt or any number you use to ider	ntify the debtor:		
7.How much is the claim?	\$	500000.00 Does this amount include interest or other charges?  ☑ No ☐ Yes, Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or				
		ot	her charges required by B	ankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).		
8.What is the basis of the claim?	death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c).  Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as healthcare information.					
	acts	entional tort arising out of breach o s.	or CPUC Code 2106 and of			
9. Is all or part of the claim secured?		No Yes. The claim is secured by a lie Nature of property: Real estate. If the claim is s Proof of Claim Motor vehicle Other. Describe:	secured by the debtor's pri	incipal residence, file a <i>Mortgage</i> a 410-A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i> .		
		Basis for perfection:				
		Attach redacted copies of docun interest (for example, a mortgag document that shows the lien has	ie. lien, certificate of title, fi	idence of perfection of a security nancing statement, or other		
		Value of property:	<u>\$</u>			
		Amount of the claim that is secured:	\$ 			
		Amount of the claim that is unsecured:	\$	(The sum of the secured and unsecured amounts should match the amount in line 7.)		
		Amount necessary to cure any date of the petition:	y default as of the \$			
		Annual Interest Rate (when ca	se was filed)	% 		
		☐ Fixed ☐ Variable				
10.ls this claim based on a lease?			re any default as of the d	ate of the petition.\$		
11.ls this claim subject to a right of setoff?	<b>☑</b>	No Yes. Identify the property:				

Case 19-30088 Claim 95-1 Filed 03/29/19 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 3 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 2548 Filed: 06/14/19 Entered: 06/14/19 15:29:41 Page 17 of 22

Proof of Claim

Official Form 410

page 2

12 ls all or part of the claim	<b>V</b>	NI-					
entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?		No Yes.	Check all	that apply	: <u></u>		Amount entitled to priority
A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example		□ Doi und	mestic su der 11 U.S	pport oblig: S.C. § 507(	ations (including alimony and a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).	child support)	\$
in some categories, the lawl imits the amount entitled to priority.	1	pro	□ Up to \$2,850* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).		\$		
entiled to priority.		□ Wa 180	ges, sala davs be	ries, or con fore the ba	nmissions (up to \$12,850*) e nkruptcy petition is filed or the ver is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507	e debtor's	\$
		☐ Tax			d to governmental units. 11 L		\$
		☐ Cor	ntributions	s to an emp	bloyee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C	\$	
		☐ Oth	ıer. Speci	fy subsecti	on of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(_) t	hat applies	\$
		* Amour of adjus		ect to adjustr	nent on 4/01/19 and every 3 years	after that for case	s begun on or after the date
Part 3: Sign Below							
The person completing this proof of claim must	Che	ck the a	appropriat	te box:			
sign and date it. FRBP		I am th	ne credito	r.			
	V	I am th	ne credito	r's attorney	or authorized agent.		
Ciccii Omiodily, i i ibi		I am th	ne trustee	, or the del	otor, or their authorized agen	t. Bankruptcy F	Rule 3004.
5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules	☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.						
specifying what a signature	I understand that an authorized signature on this Proof of Claim serves as an acknowledgment that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.						
	I have examined the information in this Proof of Claim and have a reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.						
fined up to \$500,000,	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.						
18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157 and 3571.	Executed on date 3/29/2019						
				MM / D	D/YYYY		
	/s/ /	Aaron J.	Mohamed	1			
		ature					
	-					this slaims.	
			ine or the	person wi	no is completing and signing t	uns ciaim.	
	Name			Aaron J. Mohamed			
					First name Middle name	Last name	
		Title			Attorney for Creditor		
	Company				Brereton Law Office, APC		
					Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer		
	Add	Address			1362 Pacific Ave., Suite 221		
					Number Street		
Santa Cruz, CA 95060			·-·				
					City State ZIP Code		
	Con	itact ph	one (	831) 429–6	391 Email a	ijm@brereton.la	w

Official Form 410

Proof of Claim

page 3

Case 19-30088 Claim 95-1 Filed 03/29/19 Desc Main Document Page 3 of 3 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 2548 Filed: 06/14/19 Entered: 06/14/19 15:29:41 Page 18 of 22

# **EXHIBIT B**

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 2548 Filed: 06/14/19 Entered: 06/14/19 15:29:41 Page 19 of 22

Fill in this information to identify the case:						
Debtor 1 Pacific Gas and Electric Company						
Debtor 2						
(Spouse, if filing)	4					
United States Bankruptcy Court Northern District of California						
Case number: 19–30089						

**FILED** 

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Northern District of California

6/14/2019

Edward J. Emmons, Clerk

### Official Form 410 Proof of Claim

04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies of any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. Do not send original documents; they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Clai	m						
1.Who is the current creditor?	Mark Elward  Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)  Other names the creditor used with the debtor						
Greator.							
2.Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	✓ No ☐ Yes. From whom?						
3. Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?	Where should notices to the creditor be sent?  Mark Elward	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different)					
Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g)	Name Aaron J. Mohamed, Esq. Brereton Law Office, APC 1362 Pacific Ave., Suite 221 Santa Cruz, CA 95060	Name					
	Contact phone(831) 429–6391  Contact emailajm@brereton.law  Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter	Contact phone  Contact email  13 (if you use one):					
4.Does this claim amend one already filed?	<ul><li>✓ No</li><li>☐ Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known</li></ul>	Filed on					
5.Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	No ☐ Yes. Who made the earlier filing?						

Official Form 410

Proof of Claim

page 1

6.Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?		No Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor:				
7.How much is the claim?	\$	500000.00 Does this amount include interest or other charges?  ☑ No				
			☐ Yes. Attach statement	itemizing ir by Bankru	nterest, fees, expenses, or ptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).	
B.What is the basis of the claim?  Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injudeath, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the card. Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c).  Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as healthcare information.					orting the claim required by	
	inte act	entional tort arising out of breas.	ach of CPUC Code 2016	and other w	vrongful	
9. Is all or part of the claim secured?		Yes. The claim is secured by Nature of property: Real estate. If the clai	m is secured by the debto	r's principa Form 410-	I residence, file a <i>Mortgage</i> -A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i> .	
		Basis for perfection:			·····	
		Attach redacted copies of d interest (for example, a mo document that shows the li-	rtgage, lien, certificate of t	itle, financi	e of perfection of a security ng statement, or other	
		Value of property:	\$		_	
		Amount of the claim that secured:	is \$		_	
		Amount of the claim that unsecured:	is \$		(The sum of the secured and unsecured amounts should match the amount in line 7.)	
		Amount necessary to cur date of the petition:	e any default as of the	\$		
		Annual Interest Rate (whe	en case was filed)		%	
		☐ Fixed ☐ Variable			·	
10.ls this claim based on a lease?		No Yes. <b>Amount necessary</b> to	o cure any default as of	the date o	f the petition.\$	
11.Is this claim subject to a right of setoff?	<b>∀</b>	No Yes. Identify the property:				

Case 19-30089 Claim 54 Filed 06/14/19 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 3 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 2548 Filed: 06/14/19 Entered: 06/14/19 15:29:41 Page 21 of 22

Proof of Claim

Official Form 410

page 2

12. Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?		No Yes. <i>Check a</i>	all that apply:				Amount entitled to priority
A claim may be partly priority and partly		☐ Domestic s under 11 U	upport obligat .S.C. § 507(a)	ions (inclu	uding alimony a (a)(1)(B).	and child support)	\$
nonpriority. For example in some categories, the lawl imits the amount entitled to priority.	€,	☐ Up to \$3.02	25* of deposits services for p	toward p		e, or rental of ehold use. 11	\$
enuited to phonty.		☐ Wages, sal 180 days b	aries, or comr efore the banl	cruptcy pe	tition is filed or	) earned within the debtor's	<u>\$</u>
					r is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4). to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. §		\$
		☐ Contribution	ns to an empl	oyee bene	efit plan. 11 U.S	S.C. § 507(a)(5).	\$
		☐ Other. Spec	cify subsection	n of 11 U.	S.C. § 507(a)(_	_) that applies	\$
		* Amounts are sul of adjustment.	bject to adjustme	ent on 4/01/2	22 and every 3 ye	ars after that for case	es begun on or after the date
Part 3: Sign Below							
The person completing this proof of claim must	Che	ck the appropri	ate box:				,
sign and date it. FRBP		I am the credit	or.				
9011(b).	$\checkmark$	I am the credit	or's attorney	or authoriz	zed agent.		
If you file this claim electronically, FRBP		I am the truste	e, or the debt	or, or thei	r authorized ag	gent. Bankruptcy I	Rule 3004.
5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules	☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.						
specifying what a signature is.	I understand that an authorized signature on this Proof of Claim serves as an acknowledgment that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.						
A person who files a fraudulent claim could be	I have examined the information in this Proof of Claim and have a reasonable belief that the information is true						
fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both.	and correct.  I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.						
18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157 and 3571.	Executed on date 6/14/2019						
	MM / DD / YYYY						
	/s/ /	Aaron J. Mohame	ed, Esq.		<del></del>	<del></del>	
	Sign	ature					
	Prin	t the name of th	ne person who	is compl	eting and signi	ng this claim:	
	Nan	ne		Aaron J.	Mohamed, Esq.		
				First name	Middle name	e Last name	
	Title			Attorney	for Creditor		<del></del>
	Con	npany		Brereton	Law Office, AP	c	
				Identify the servicer	corporate service	er as the company if t	he authorized agent is a
	Add	Iress		Brereton	Law Office, AP	C, 1362 Pacific A	
				Number Street			
				Santa Cru	ız, CA 95060		
	Cor	ntact phone	(831) 429–63	•	ZIP Code Email	ajm@brereton.la	aw
•						<u>-</u>	

page 3 Proof of Claim Official Form 410